

January 27, 2021
Xue-Ying Liang.
Editors-in-Chief
World Journal of Gastroenterology
Re: Manuscript reference No.61519

Dear Editors:

We sincerely thank you and all reviewers for the valuable feedback. We feel lucky that our manuscript went to these reviewers as the valuable comments from them not only helped us with the improvement of our manuscript, but suggested some neat ideas for future studies. Please do forward our heartfelt thanks to these experts. In the following pages are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments of the reviewers.

Reviewer #1:

Comment 1: The description of Group C and D in the RESULTS of the ABSTRACT is not consistent with that in the main text, and does not accord with the statistical significance ($P=0.038$, According to statistical analysis, it is statistically significant, and the author wrote in the article "There was no significant difference").

Answer: Thanks for your help. I feel really sorry for my carelessness. This is a stupid mistake made in my writing. The difference between group C and group D is significant ($P = 0.038$). I have made modifications in Table 5 of the RESULTS (On page 16) and results in the ABSTRACT (On page 4). The modifications are marked in red.

Comment 2: In the result section of the manuscript, the analysis of "Correlation between inflammation indicators and ALI/ARDS" and "Correlation between changes in the gut microbiota and ALI/ARDS" can be more comprehensive, for example, whether the comparison between any two groups is statistically significant?

Answer: Thanks you for your suggestions. According to your suggestions, I have supplemented pairwise comparison results (On page 13). This makes my article richer. The modifications are marked in green.

Reviewer #3:

Comment 1: The Abstract is not good enough and needs to be revised. The purpose of the manuscript is "to analyze the relationship between intestinal flora change and ALI/ARDS in the early stage of SAP". However, Method part is not clearly described, the relationship between intestinal flora change and hydrogen breath test needs to be made clear in the background part or the method part. Besides, the result is too simple.

Answer: Thanks you for your nice comments on our article. In the revised version, changes to

our manuscript were all highlighted within the document by using blue colored text(on page 3 and 4).

Comment 2: On page 12, authors described "There was no statistical significance in the number of gut microbiota and ALI/ARDS in the MSAP group (passport 0.353) (Table 5)". But according to the Method part, MSAP group was divided into Group A and Group B, SAP group was divided into Group C and Group D. However, Group C and Group D appeared in Table 5. Is the description wrong? In addition, there is the same problem in Table 4, please check it carefully.

Answer: Thanks for your help. I feel really sorry for my carelessness. This is a stupid mistake make in my writing. The difference between group C and group D was significant ($P = 0.038$). I have made modifications in Table 5 of the RESULTS (On page 16). The modifications are marked in red.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Xue-Ying Liang, Author.